



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1470
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,740	07/14/2003	Atul K. Puri	07844-594001	7020
21876	7590	11/14/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. Box 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			BOTTS, MICHAEL K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/619,740

Applicant(s)

PURI ET AL.

Examiner

Michael K. Botts

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 28, 2006 has been entered.
2. This is a Non-Final Office Action.
3. Claims 1-34 have been examined, with claims 1, 14, 17, 18, 31, and 34 being the independent claims.
4. Claims 1-34 are rejected.

The Specification

5. Applicant is reminded of the continuing requirement to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification, when appropriate, and the status of all citations of U.S. filed applications in the specification should also be updated, when appropriate.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2176

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Wu, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,987,256) [hereinafter "Wu"].

Regarding independent claim 1, as amended, Wu teaches:

A method for configuring at least a portion of a document for display in a display environment, the method including:

generating a document color palette for all or a portion of an electronic document, the colors of the document color palette being selected based on colors of a plurality of color containing objects in the document or portion thereof; and

(See, Wu, independent claim 1, stating in part: "A method of translating a document on a first device for use on a second device, the document being in a standard HTML language, the method comprising: . . . retrieving a plurality of images referenced by the document, generating a color palette for the second platform using the plurality of images and the document . . .")

See also, Wu, dependent claim 10, stating in part: "The method of claim 3 wherein the generating the color palette using the plurality of images and the document comprises: creating a set of colors comprised of all colors used in the plurality of images and all colors used in the document . . .")

generating a plurality of views of the document for display in a single display environment, two or more of the views being based on different color palettes, the plurality of views including a document view and an object view, the document view including each of the plurality of color containing objects, and the object view including one of the plurality of color containing objects,

wherein a display of the document view in the display environment involves rendering the color containing objects in the document view using the document color palette, and

wherein a display of the object view in the display environment involves rendering the one color containing object in the object view using an object color palette associated with the object view.

(See, Wu, independent claim 1, stating in part: “translating the plurality of images from respective formats to the supported image format, and outputting a translated document, the translated document including at least a reference to the color palette . . .” See also, Wu, Figure 6 and dependent claims 4 and 10.

The “document view” is disclosed as the each of the plurality of color containing objects, where “each color containing object in the document view is represented using the document color palette.” See, disclosure, page 2, lines 20-21. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, a “document view” may be an original document. See, Wu, col. 5, line 12 through col. 6, line 7, teaching that an original document is loaded with the original color specification. The original document is the document view.

The “object view” is disclosed as “based on a corresponding object color palette

of the corresponding graphics object, and each object color palette includes a set of colors optimized for the corresponding graphics object” See, disclosure, page 3, lines 8-10. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, the “object view” is any object for which the colors have been adapted for optimization of the object. See, Wu, col. 5, line 17 through col. 6, line 16, teaching that the colors for an object are optimized based on the parameters of the target device. The target device is the justification for the optimization and defines its parameters. Merely because the object is optimized based on the parameters of the device in which it will ultimately be displayed, does not negate the optimization itself.

The Examiner understands Applicants’ argument to be that Wu fails to teach or suggest a display with a certain color palette and specifications and a document within the display with a different color palette and specification.

Wu teaches that an original HTML document with an original palette and color specification is input and then modified to conform to the color palette and specifications of a “target device,” such as a thin client or a device with limited color capabilities. The new color palette and specifications are then saved. See, Wu, tables 1-3 and col. 5, line 1 through col. 6, line 16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display both the original and the modified document on a single display, such as a split screen or separate windows. The suggestion or motivation for the combination would have been the obvious and beneficial purpose of checking for accuracy and acceptability in the translation from the original to target colors.)

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising:

associating the document color palette with the document or document portion.

(See, Wu, Figure 6, and claims 1, 4, and 10.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein:

generating the document color palette includes selecting a set of colors based on selection factors and colors in the plurality of color containing objects.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 11.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4**, Wu in view of Dietz teaches:

The method of claim 3, wherein:

the selection factors include at least one of most used colors in the plurality of color containing objects, colors common to the plurality of objects , and a set of substitutable colors.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 10, stating: "The method of claim 1 wherein the supported image format includes a color palette indexed bitmap format and the translating the plurality of images from respective formats to the supported image format comprises: decoding each of the plurality of images into a red-green-blue bitmap format; selecting a

Art Unit: 2176

color in the color palette for pixels in each of the plurality of images; and outputting a color palette indexed bitmap format for each of the plurality of images.”)

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein generating a document color palette includes:

creating a bitmap of the document or portion thereof; and

reducing the colors of the bitmap to generate the document color palette.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 10.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 5, wherein:

reducing the number of colors of the bitmap includes selecting a subset of

colors of the bitmap, the subset being selected based on the number of colors

supported in the display environment.

(see, Wu, dependent claim 10.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 6, wherein the bitmap includes N colors and the subset of

colors includes M colors, where $M < N$.

(see, Wu, dependent claim 10.)

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising:

*rendering the document or document portion in the display environment
using the document view.*

(See, Wu, claim 1, stating in part: "outputting a translated document, the translated document including at least a reference to the color palette . . .")

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, Wu teaches:

*The method of claim 1, wherein the objects include at least one graphics object
and at least one text object, each text object including one or more characters of
text.*

(See, Wu, dependent claim 12, stating: "The method of claim 1 wherein the translated document includes a plurality of text elements and a plurality of graphics drawing elements.")

Regarding **dependent claim 10, as amended**, Wu teaches:

*The method of claim 1, wherein generating a plurality of views of the document
includes:*

*generating an object view of one or more of the plurality of graphics
objects in an electronic document, each object view being based on a
corresponding object color palette of the corresponding graphics object, each
object color palette including a set of colors optimized for the corresponding
graphics object.*

Art Unit: 2176

(Wu teaches the generation of a translated document wherein the color palette of the translated document is smaller than that of the original document. It is inherent from the teachings of Wu that more than one document could be generated. See, Wu, Figure 10, specifically teaching translations of a document to “thin” platforms A, B, and C, as shown in figure 10 elements 104, 105, and 106.)

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 10, further comprising:

generating an object color palette for each of the one or more of the plurality of graphics objects.

(See, Wu, independent claim 1, stating in part: “retrieving a plurality of images referenced by the document, generating a color palette for the second platform using the plurality of images and the document, . . . translating the plurality of images from respective formats to the supported image format, and outputting a translated document, the translated document including at least a reference to the color palette, . . .” See also, Wu, dependent claims 4, 7, 10, and 12.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 10, further comprising:

storing the object views in the electronic document, each object view being associated with a corresponding document view.

Art Unit: 2176

(See, Wu, Figures 12A and 12B, showing saving the data. See also, Wu, col. 9, lines 33-59, teaching saving compiled data to a “non-volatile storage medium” in an off-line environment for later transmission to a “thin platform.”)

Regarding **dependent claim 13**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein the plurality of views includes two different document views, each document view based on a different document color palette.

(See, Wu, Figure 10, teaching the document being translated for platforms as shown by elements 104-106. Further, it is noted that Wu is directed to tailoring the data to color and rendering capabilities of the receiving platform. See, Wu, col. 5, line 17 through col. 6, line 7, teaching parsing the original data, including color data, to fit the limitations of the target device. It is inherent from the tailoring function that more than one document view will be created.)

Regarding **independent claim 14, as amended**, Wu teaches:

*A method for rendering an image in a display environment, the method including:
receiving an electronic document including multiple views for each of a plurality of graphics objects of the electronic document, the multiple views being based on different color palettes, the multiple views for rendering in a single display environment, a first view for each graphics object being based on a color palette for the graphics object and the second view for each graphics object*

being based on a document color palette for an associated portion of the electronic document; and

rendering the portion of the electronic document according to the second view of each of the plurality of graphics objects.

(See, Wu, col. 19, lines 16-67, teaching and intranet environment and an off-line environment where the originating data is stored and then later translated and saved to a separate files for use by different target users. The server stores both "views" of the document and renders the translated document to the target user.

The "document view" is disclosed as the each of the plurality of color containing objects, where "each color containing object in the document view is represented using the document color palette." See, disclosure, page 2, lines 20-21. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, a "document view" may be an original document. See, Wu, col. 5, line 12 through col. 6, line 7, teaching that an original document is loaded with the original color specification. The original document is the document view.

The "object view" is disclosed as "based on a corresponding object color palette of the corresponding graphics object, and each object color palette includes a set of colors optimized for the corresponding graphics object" See, disclosure, page 3, lines 8-10. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, the "object view" is any object for which the colors have been adapted for optimization of the object. See, Wu, col. 5, line 17 through col. 6, line 16, teaching that the colors for an object are optimized based on the parameters of the target device. The target device is the justification for the optimization and defines its parameters. Merely because the object is optimized based

Art Unit: 2176

on the parameters of the device in which it will ultimately be displayed, does not negate the optimization itself.

The Examiner understands Applicants' argument to be that Wu fails to teach or suggest a display with a certain color palette and specifications and a document within the display with a different color palette and specification.

Wu teaches that an original HTML document with an original palette and color specification is input and then modified to conform to the color palette and specifications of a "target device," such as a thin client or a device with limited color capabilities. The new color palette and specifications are then saved. See, Wu, tables 1-3 and col. 5, line 1 through col. 6, line 16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display both the original and the modified document on a single display, such as a split screen or separate windows. The suggestion or motivation for the combination would have been the obvious and beneficial purpose of checking for accuracy and acceptability in the translation from the original to target colors.)

Regarding **dependent claim 15**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 14, further comprising:

receiving input selecting a graphics object in the electronic document; and

rendering the selected graphics object according to the first view of the

selected graphics object.

(It is noted that the view rendered in this claim is according to the full attributes of the original document. See, Wu, Figure 10, and col. 18, line 49 through 53, showing the connection of a user platform to a network. See also Wu, Figures 10, 11, 12A and 12B, teaching the saving of the object file and sending files to target devices. It is noted that since the invention of Wu processes the original data to a limited form that is appropriate for a more limited target device. It is further noted that if the target device had no limitations, and could accept the original file content, including the original color palette, then the view transferred would be the original or first view.)

Regarding **dependent claim 16**, Wu teaches:

The method of claim 14, wherein the portion of the electronic document includes at least one text object, each text object including one or more characters of text and associated color content, the method further comprising:

rendering the at least one text object using the document color palette for the portion of the electronic document.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 7, teaching specifically the generation and rendering of text objects, including color attributes. See also, Wu, dependent claim 12, teaching that the translated document contains text elements.)

Regarding **independent claim 17, as amended**, Wu teaches:

A method for configuring at least a portion of a document for display in a display environment, the method including:

*receiving an electronic document including multiple graphics objects; and
generating a display document including multiple views of each of the
multiple graphics objects, the multiple views for display in a single display
environment, each view of the multiple views based on a different color palette
and representing a different portion of the electronic document.*

(See, Wu, dependent claim 8, teaching specifically the generation and rendering of graphics drawing elements. See also, Wu, dependent claim 12, teaching that the translated document contains graphics elements. The “document view” is disclosed as the each of the plurality of color containing objects, where “each color containing object in the document view is represented using the document color palette.” See, disclosure, page 2, lines 20-21. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, a “document view” may be an original document. See, Wu, col. 5, line 12 through col. 6, line 7, teaching that an original document is loaded with the original color specification. The original document is the document view.

The “object view” is disclosed as “based on a corresponding object color palette of the corresponding graphics object, and each object color palette includes a set of colors optimized for the corresponding graphics object” See, disclosure, page 3, lines 8-10. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, the “object view” is any object for which the colors have been adapted for optimization of the object. See, Wu, col. 5, line 17 through col. 6, line 16, teaching that the colors for an object are optimized based on the parameters of the target device. The target device is the justification for the optimization and defines its parameters. Merely because the object is optimized based

on the parameters of the device in which it will ultimately be displayed, does not negate the optimization itself.

The Examiner understands Applicants' argument to be that Wu fails to teach or suggest a display with a certain color palette and specifications and a document within the display with a different color palette and specification.

Wu teaches that an original HTML document with an original palette and color specification is input and then modified to conform to the color palette and specifications of a "target device," such as a thin client or a device with limited color capabilities. The new color palette and specifications are then saved. See, Wu, tables 1-3 and col. 5, line 1 through col. 6, line 16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display both the original and the modified document on a single display, such as a split screen or separate windows. The suggestion or motivation for the combination would have been the obvious and beneficial purpose of checking for accuracy and acceptability in the translation from the original to target colors.)

Regarding **claim 18, as amended**, claim 18 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claims 19-28**, claims 19-28 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 2-13, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **claim 31, as amended**, claim 31 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 14 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claims 32 and 33**, claims 32 and 33 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 15 and 16, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claim 34, as amended**, claim 34 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 17, and is rejected along the same rationale.

6. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed August 28, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejections of independent claims 1 and 18:

FIRST: Applicants argue that the reference, Wu, fails to teach or suggest "the

'object view' and the 'document view' being generated for display in a single display environment." See, Remarks, page 11.

The Examiner disagrees.

The "document view" is disclosed as the each of the plurality of color containing objects, where "each color containing object in the document view is represented using the document color palette." See, disclosure, page 2, lines 20-21. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, a "document view" may be an original document. See, Wu, col. 5, line 12 through col. 6, line 7, teaching that an original document is loaded with the original color specification. The original document is the document view.

The "object view" is disclosed as "based on a corresponding object color palette of the corresponding graphics object, and each object color palette includes a set of colors optimized for the corresponding graphics object" See, disclosure, page 3, lines 8-10. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, the "object view" is any object for which the colors have been adapted for optimization of the object. See, Wu, col. 5, line 17 through col. 6, line 16, teaching that the colors for an object are optimized based on the parameters of the target device. The target device is the justification for the optimization and defines its parameters. Merely because the object is optimized based on the parameters of the device in which it will ultimately be displayed, does not negate the optimization itself.

The Examiner understands Applicants' argument to be that Wu fails to teach or suggest a display with a certain color palette and specifications and a document within the display with a different color palette and specification.

Wu teaches that an original HTML document with an original palette and color specification is input and then modified to conform to the color palette and specifications of a "target device," such as a thin client or a device with limited color capabilities. The new color palette and specifications are then saved. See, Wu, tables 1-3 and col. 5, line 1 through col. 6, line 16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display both the original and the modified document on a single display, such as a split screen or separate windows. The suggestion or motivation for the combination would have been the obvious and beneficial purpose of checking for accuracy and acceptability in the translation from the original to target colors.

SECOND: Applicants argue that the reference, Wu, fails to teach or suggest "using different color palettes to render the views of the pages of the translated document for display in a display environment of the target device." See, Remarks, page 11.

The Examiner disagrees.

Wu teaches that an original HTML document with an original palette and color specification is input and then modified to conform to the color palette and specifications of a "target device," such as a thin client or a device with limited color capabilities. The new color palette and specifications are then saved. See, Wu, tables 1-3 and col. 5, line 1 through col. 6, line 16. The purpose of Wu is to prepare a modified document in a modified color palette and specification for display in a target device. See, Wu,

abstract, stating: "The second data set is stored in a machine readable storage device, for later retrieval and execution by the thin client platform."

Additional References

Miller, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,731,823) teaching image displays with graphics of varying color and grain.

Conclusion

Individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application are reminded of their obligations pursuant to 37 CFR 1.56. See generally, MPEP 2001 and subsections.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 2176

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100